



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/751,748	12/29/2000	Lawrence Henry Hudepohl	MIPS:0107.00US	7126
23669	23669 7590 02/08/2006 EXAMINER			
HUFFMAN LAW GROUP, P.C. 1832 N. CASCADE AVE.		TREAT, WILLIAM M		
COLORADO	SPRINGS, CO 80	07-7449	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2181	

DATE MAILED: 02/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summa	09/751,748	HUDEPOHL ET AL.
Examiner-initiated interview Summa	Examiner	Art Unit
	William M. Treat	2181
All Participants:	Status of Application:	
(1) William M. Treat.	(3)	
(2) <u>James W. Huffman</u> .	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>17 January 2006</u>	Time:	
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ North Yes, provide a brief description:	•	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed: none		
Claims discussed:		
Prior art documents discussed:  Missing 1449		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE See Continuation Sheet	GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequirectly resulted in the allowance of the applicat of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief sequipment of the interview is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequipment of the interview is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequipment of the interview is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequipment of the interview in the interview is not necessary for applicant to provide a sequipment of the interview in the</li></ul>	tion. The examiner will provide a writte parate record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
	## # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # # #	
PR PR	VILLIAM M. TREAT NIMARY EXAMINER	
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (A)	pplicant/Applicant's Representative Signature	inature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner phoned applicants' representative in response to an earlier phone message. The applicants' representative reported that an IDS which had been submitted on 5/25/2005, prior to the examiner's notice of allowance, was not one of the 1449's returned by the examiner. The examiner apologized for the oversight and after looking at the eDAN file again found the 1449 without copies of the non-patent literature. The examiner requested that he be faxed copies of the NPL to his personal fax number to expedite matters. The examiner is still uncertain as to whether the missing 1449 was a malfunction in eDAN or a failure of the contractor to scan the information in a timely manner though he suspects the latter. The examiner is of this opinion because the NPL documents have magically appeared in eDAN though he is certain they were not present when he talked with applicants' representative. Attached are a copy of the reviewed 1449 and a PTOL-90 with the examiner's comments related to the art.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO.J CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION			
				EXAMINER	
			ART UNIT	PAPER	
				20060126	

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## **Commissioner for Patents**

The examiner found much of the functionality necessary for applicants' invention, such as multiple instruction-busy signals and dual instruction issue, present in the Opal Coprocessor Interface. However, the reference was silent as to what occurred, for example, in the dual instruction issue case when one of the two instructions was blocked by a relevant busy signal.

M 2 C 4

WILLIAM M. TREAT PRIMARY EXAMINER